



STATE OF NEW YORK  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ANDREW M. CUOMO

GREG RIMER

# FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE: 1/23/08

NUMBER OF PAGES: 6  
(INCLUDING THIS PAGE)

TO: Leo Drozdoff

FAX NO.: (775)687-5856

FROM: Morgan Costello  
Assistant Attorney General

REMARKS: See attached.

Nevada  
Environmental Protection

JAN 29 2008

BAPC / BAQP

**IF THERE IS A PROBLEM WITH THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CONTACT**

NAME: Lisa Hollner OFFICE: Environmental Protection Bureau

TELEPHONE NO.: (518) 474-9267 FAX NO.: (518) 473-6818

## CONFIDENTIAL

The information contained in this facsimile is privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this is strictly prohibited.

**IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR,  
PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE SENDER BY TELEPHONE. THANK YOU.**

THE CAPITOL, ALBANY, NY 12224-0341



STATE OF NEW YORK  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ANDREW M. CUOMO

MIKE ELGES

# FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE: 1/23/08

NUMBER OF PAGES: 6  
(INCLUDING THIS PAGE)

TO: Leo Drozdoff

FAX NO.: (775)687-5856

FROM: Morgan Costello  
Assistant Attorney General

REMARKS: See attached.

Nevada  
Environmental Protection

JAN 23 2008

BAPC / BAQP

**IF THERE IS A PROBLEM WITH THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CONTACT**

NAME: Lisa Hollner OFFICE: Environmental Protection Bureau

TELEPHONE NO.: (518) 474-9267 FAX NO.: (518) 473-6818

## CONFIDENTIAL

The information contained in this facsimile is privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this is strictly prohibited.

**IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR,  
PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE SENDER BY TELEPHONE. THANK YOU.**

THE CAPITOL, ALBANY, NY 12224-0341

OAG 005 (1/07)



STATE OF NEW YORK  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ANDREW M. CUOMO

# FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE: 1/23/08

NUMBER OF PAGES: 6  
(INCLUDING THIS PAGE)

TO: Francisco Vega

FAX NO.: (775)687-6396

FROM: Morgan Costello  
Assistant Attorney General

REMARKS: See attached.

**IF THERE IS A PROBLEM WITH THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CONTACT**

NAME: Lisa Hollner OFFICE: Environmental Protection Bureau

TELEPHONE NO.: (518) 474-9267 FAX NO.: (518) 473-6818

## CONFIDENTIAL

The information contained in this facsimile is privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this is strictly prohibited.

**IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR,  
PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE SENDER BY TELEPHONE. THANK YOU.**

THE CAPITOL, ALBANY, NY 12224-0341

**Maine Attorney General G. Steven Rowe  
New York Attorney General Andrew M. Cuomo**

January 23, 2008

**VIA FACSIMILE & U.S. MAIL**

Nevada Division of Environmental Protection  
Attn: Francisco Vega  
Bureau of Air Pollution Control  
901 South Stewart Street, Suite 4001  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5249

**RE: Ely Energy Center Draft Permit**

Dear Mr. Vega:

The Attorneys General of the States of Maine and New York jointly submit these comments to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) to voice concerns regarding the proposed issuance of an air quality permit to Sierra Pacific Resources Company (Sierra Pacific) for the construction of a coal-fired power plant near the town of Ely, White Pine County, Nevada. As explained below, we urge NDEP not to issue a permit for the proposed Ely Energy Center Generating Station unless Sierra Pacific designs and sites the plant in a way that minimizes the generation of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions and/or allows for the capture and secure sequestration of such emissions.

Climate change is the single greatest environmental challenge facing the world today. Although climate change is a global problem, effective action at the national, regional, and state level is needed to achieve the necessary reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Scientists overwhelmingly agree that the global community must reduce emission of greenhouse gases, including CO<sub>2</sub>, to well below 1990 levels within a few decades if we are to stabilize the climate at an acceptable level. And, according to the experts, taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is needed immediately. As the chairman of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently declared: "If there's no action before 2012, that's too late. What we do in the next two to three years will determine our future."

To that end, many states have made the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions a priority. For example, ten northeastern states (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont) participate in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), a mandatory cap-and-trade program to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from power plants, which collectively represent a major contributor to global warming. By 2019, the RGGI states will achieve a 10%

reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, with a cumulative reduction below baseline of roughly 50 million tons. Similarly, California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act, AB 32, in 2006, which requires the state's utilities, oil refiners, cement makers, and other large industrial greenhouse gas emitters to reduce their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. California also enacted in 2006 California Public Utilities Code, section 8340 et seq., which precludes California utilities from entering contracts for electricity from high-emitting sources of CO<sub>2</sub>, both inside and outside of California. Other states are considering or have adopted similar power plant performance standards.

Arizona, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Washington have joined California as members in the Western Climate Initiative. Nevada has agreed to be an observer of the program. Under this agreement, member states will reduce emissions by 15% below 2005 levels by 2020. Further, six Midwestern states just signed the Midwestern Regional Greenhouse Gas Reduction Accord committing to a regional cap-and-trade program for CO<sub>2</sub>. Along with the states participating in RGGI and the Western Climate Initiative, this new Midwestern accord brings the number of states committed to regional trading systems to 23.

In contrast to these efforts, the proposed Ely Energy Center plant would substantially increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Nevada sources. As proposed, the new 1,500 MW coal-fired plant would utilize traditional coal-burning technology, which emits massive amounts of CO<sub>2</sub>. The proposed plant is projected to emit more than 14 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year, thereby seriously undermining the concerted efforts being undertaken by multiple states to address global warming. For instance, over the RGGI time frame, cumulative emissions from this plant would be more than 140 million tons CO<sub>2</sub>, more than canceling the reductions relative to baseline resulting from RGGI. In fact, emissions from just one of the two proposed boilers would more than cancel the RGGI reductions. With a lifetime of more than 50 years, this plant, if built as proposed, might well emit more than 700 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> in total, thus significantly contributing to the public health and environmental damage associated with global warming.

We encourage you to explore alternatives that will allow Nevada to satisfy its need for energy without exacerbating global warming. As an initial matter, implementation of energy conservation measures and construction of additional non-polluting renewable energy sources could reduce, or even obviate, the need for new coal-fired power in Nevada. As Governor Gibbons recently recognized in his Executive Order establishing the Nevada Climate Change Committee, Nevada has an abundance of renewable energy resources. A recent report by McKinsey & Co. concluded that improved energy efficiency in buildings, appliances and industrial plants could offset about 85% of projected increase in demand for U.S. electricity in 2030, obviating the need to build 150 or so new coal plants - such as the Ely plant - now on the drawing

boards in response to projected demand. McKinsey & Co., *Reducing U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions: How Much at What Cost?*, at xv, 30, & Ex. 18. (Dec. 2007).

If a new power plant is still needed, we urge the state to consider fueling such plant with biomass or natural gas, or both, and to consider siting so as to allow for full-scale carbon capture and sequestration (CCS). Biomass and natural gas not only emit a fraction of the CO<sub>2</sub> compared to coal, and eliminate emissions of pollutants such as mercury, and other heavy metals, they also improve the efficiency of the production process, further reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In addition, we urge you to consider Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) technology, an established and available production process with lower emissions than pulverized coal. In general, retrofitting an IGCC plant to capture CO<sub>2</sub> emissions likely will be less expensive than retrofitting a pulverized coal plant. Finally, we ask that you consider requiring Sierra Pacific to offset CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as a permit condition.

Further, state and federal laws require issuance of a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) air quality permit by NDEP to Sierra Pacific prior to construction of the Ely Energy Center plant. To obtain a PSD permit, Sierra Pacific must demonstrate that the proposed Ely project complies with the best available control technology (BACT). The BACT standard requires PSD applicants to consider other "production processes or available methods, systems, and techniques" including "innovative fuel combustion techniques" to achieve the "maximum degree of reduction for each pollutant subject to regulation" under the Clean Air Act (CAA). The BACT standard in the CAA also requires consideration of "clean fuels." This plain language and the legislative history of the CAA make clear that Congress intended that the full range of cleaner fuels, including biomass and natural gas, and production methodologies, including coal gasification, would be considered in a BACT analysis. *See, e.g.*, 123 Cong. Rec. 18472 (1977) (Senator Walter Huddleston of Kentucky explaining that the term "innovative fuel combustion techniques" was added to the definition of BACT to clarify that BACT was "intended to include such technologies as low BTU gasification"). Thus, a BACT analysis for the Ely project must consider biomass and natural gas, as well as IGCC technology, a form of coal gasification.

The PSD permit for the Ely Energy Center plant should include a BACT emission limit for CO<sub>2</sub>. A BACT emission limit is required "for each pollutant subject to regulation under [the Act]." 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(4); *see* 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(50)(iv). The Supreme Court held in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 127 S.Ct. 1438, 1460 (2007) that CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases are "pollutants" under the CAA. Not only does EPA have the authority to regulate CO<sub>2</sub> under the CAA, it must do so if it concludes that CO<sub>2</sub> from power plants and other sources "may reasonably be anticipated to endanger the public health and welfare." Overwhelming scientific evidence compels this conclusion. Given that the Ely plant will be a major emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>, NDEP should require Sierra Pacific to demonstrate that the proposed technology for the plant is the best available control

NDEP

January 23, 2008

Page 4

technology for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. A full BACT analysis would inevitably lead to the conclusion that the Ely proposal includes inadequate controls on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Furthermore, NDEP must consider the "energy, environmental, and economic impacts" of each unit as part of the BACT analysis. This analysis extends to the overall environmental impacts of the units. *See, e.g., In re North Country Resource Recovery Associates*, 2 E.A.D. 229, 230, 1986 EPA App. LEXIS 14 (Adm'r 1986). The detrimental environmental effects of the increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions resulting from the proposed new plant must be considered under the "environmental impacts" prong of BACT, which in turn informs the selection of control technology.

We recognize the need for additional sources of energy, but urge NDEP to fully consider whether efficiency improvements or non-polluting sources of electricity can meet increased demand for the next several years. If increased electricity-generating capacity beyond these options is nonetheless needed, we urge NDEP to work with Sierra Pacific to require that the plant be constructed so as to minimize and offset CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and sited so as to allow for CCS.

We thank you for considering our view on this important matter.

Sincerely,

ANDREW M. CUOMO  
NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL

By:



Katherine Kennedy  
Special Deputy Attorney General for  
Environmental Protection  
Morgan A. Costello  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
The Capitol  
Albany, NY 12224  
(518) 473-5843

NDEP  
January 23, 2008  
Page 5

G. STEVEN ROWE  
MAINE ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: Gerald Reid CMC

Gerald D. Reid  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333-0006  
(207) 626-8800

cc: Governor Jim Gibbons  
Nevada Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto  
Leo Drozdoff, Administrator, NDEP